DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 482 TM 015 659

AUTHOR Harris, R. Carl; Harris, Melanie F.
TITLE Symbiosis on Trial in Educational Renewal.
PUB DATE Oct 90
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association (Greeley, CO, October 4-6, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Programs; Educational Change; *Educational Quality; Elementary Education; Elementary Schools; Elementary School Teachers; Higher Education; Principals; Professors; *Program Evaluation; Public Schools; *School Districts; Shared Resources and Services; Universities; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Brigham Young Univ Public School Partnership; Partnerships in Education

ABSTRACT

The collaboration of universities and schools/school districts has often been proposed as an effective force for reviewing the quality of the schools and the education of the educators. A study of a workshop that was a major collaborative event in an ongoing university-schools partnership illustrated that symbiotic and organic cooperation is functioning in the Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership, which was initiated in 1984. A Linking Workshop in 1989 provided 16 hours of intensive interaction between university and elementary school educators during a 2-day period. Participants included 24 university professors, 8 principals, and 88 teachers. Interviews and reviews of documents generated during the conference were used to evaluate the program in terms of: (1) common goal; (2) participants and participation; (3) equity and trust; and (4) self-interest and selflessness. Analyses of qualitative and quantitative data from the workshop showed high levels of agreement on common educational renewal goals and participation by university and school personnel in all aspects of the collaborative effort. Acceptance of professional equity was evident, and mutual self-interest and selflessness were apparent. The requirements for such collaboration are discussed. Three tables contain data from the analysis. (SLD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED325482

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. CARL HARRIS
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

# Symbiosis on Trial in Educational Renewal

by

R. Carl Harris
Department of Elementary Education
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

Melanie F. Harris
Rees Elementary School
Spanish Fork, Utah

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association

Ramkota Hotel, Greeley, Colorado
October 4-6, 1990

TM015659

# Symbiosis on Trial in Educational Renewal

by
R. Carl Harris
Brigham Young University
Melanie F. Harris
Nebo School District

During the decade of the 80's, education reform experts have repeatedly advocated long-term, substantive collaboration between universities and schools (districts) as a potentially effective force for renewing both the quality of schools and the education of educators. However, the same experts have been equally vocal in expressing their disillusionment over past and present university/school experiments that were undercommitted, short sighted and short termed, more rhetoric than action, tradition bound, or self-serving to the exclusion of fundamental reform.

We find a possible exception to this negative analysis in the BYU-Public School Partnership, now beginning its seventh year of symbiotic/organic collaboration. Symbiotic/organic collaboration, a distinctive form of university/school linkage, is characterized by the partners sharing a common goal for educational renewal, actively participating in all facets of the partnership, enjoying equity and trust between the partners, and balancing self-interest and selflessness. Goodlad, a long-time proponent of site-based, university-school collaboration, proposed the simultaneous renewal of schools and the education of educators through organic or symbiotic collaboration between universities and schools as equal partners (Olson, 1986, 1987).

The Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership, one of the first university-school partnerships to seriously respond to Goodlad's proposal, is the oldest continuously functioning member of Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal (Goodlad, 1988a) The purpose of this investigation was to study a major collaborative event of this six-year old university-school partnership, which has achieved success in going beyond the traditional change model (Clark & Wilson, 1990). The sections below will portray the significance of the study, briefly describe the background of the partnership, outline procedures used to collect and analyze data, report our findings, and suggest implications for setting university/school partnership policy when using the symbiotic/organic collaboration model.

## Significance of the Study

Goodlad states that "joining schools [and school districts] and universities in commonly purposive and mutually beneficial linkages is a virtually untried and, therefore, unstudied phenomenon." (Goodlad, 1986 p. 9) More recently, Arends, writing in the 1990 ASCD Yearbook on connecting the university to the school was equally skeptical: "The problems facing schools and colleges of education in universities are incredibly complicated. Even though myriad remedies abound, none are close to being implemented." (Arends, 1990, p.134).

With the six-year continuance of the BYU-Public School Partnership, it can no longer be said that symbiotic collaboration is untried or not close to being implemented. However, except in a few instances (e.g., Trubowitz, et al., 1984) it is largely unstudied. Since collaboration between university faculty and school personnel for the preparation of teachers and renewal of schools is one of the most prominent reform models (Yinger & Hendricks, 1990; Wilbur et al., 1987), this study has been undertaken to provide information to guide policy making and further reform.

## Background of Partnership

At the same time that *A Nation At Risk* was prepared by the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983), Goodlad consulted with the Dean of the BYU College of Education (which produced over half of the new teachers in the state of Utah) and superintendents from five Utah school districts (which enrolled about one third of the public school students in the state). In April 1984 the university/school partnership was organized with six equal partners comprising the partnership governing board--the superintendents of the five school districts and the College of Education Dean. Task forces for principal and teacher education were formed, and by the spring of 1986 five elementary schools had accepted an opportunity to become Partner Schools.

"Partner School" was a designation given a school as it entered into a long-term, collaborative relationship with the university's Department of Elementary Education. Both the university and the schools agreed as equal partners to work for the renewal of schools and improvement of teacher education. Each Partner School was assigned a volunteer member of the university elementary teacher education faculty, along with approximately 18 BYU students majoring in elementary education. The

school principal, the teachers, and the university coordinator worked on a renewal agenda structured around the four Partner School tasks: 1) preservice education for new teachers, 2) inservice education (staff development) for practicing teachers in the school, 3) curriculum development to improve the learning experiences of pupils, and 4) research and evaluation to foster university and school inquiry (Harris, et al., 1989a).

An opportunity for us to systematically examine this collaboration occurred in the form of a Linking Workshop--16 intensive hours of interaction between university and school educators distributed over a two-day period. Most of the participants had additional partnership experiences, including three other networking workshops, numerous cross-district Partner Schools Committee meetings, daily on-site interaction, inservice experiences, and other experiences in which they jointly prepared over 500 new elementary teachers during the course of several years (Green & Harris, 1990).

## Research Problem and Procedures

Goodlad has stated: "I believe the two cultures [university and school] will bump up against each other in the future and become increasingly symbiotically and organically joined." (1988a p. 29). After six years of "bumping up against each other" we attempted to assess results of this symbiotic/organic joining through the 1989 Partner Schools Linking Workshop. Based on the model of symbiotic/organic collaboration, the following variables were anticipated for any major collaboration between the university and schools:

Variable 1: Common goal.

Variable 2: Participants and participation.

Variable 3: Equity and trust

Variable 4: Self-interest and selflessness.

Both quantitative and qualitative approaches were employed to provide a holistic view of symbiotic or organic collaboration variables.

### *Methodology*

The 1989 Partner Schools Linking Workshop focused the participants' energies on reflecting and projecting about needed renewal for the university and the schools. As the workshop guide states,

"The two purposes of the workshop are the improvement of on-campus and field experiences for education students and the renewal of partner schools to improve the learning of elementary students" (Harris, et al, 1989b, p. 3). All presentations were video taped and transcribed; all discussion notes, final recommendations, and field notes were collected; and all interviews audio taped and transcribed; we were then able to create a highly contextualized, thick description (Spradley, 1980) of university and school reflections and projections which allowed for triangulation (Mathison, 1988) of findings.

An overriding concern in formulating this study was the fit between our research questions, data collection and analysis techniques (Howe & Eisenhart, 1990). Thus we chose a research design which used both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

*Data Collection and Analysis*

We used three forms of data collection. The primary source of data included all university and school presentations, discussion notes, and final renewal recommendations captured during the Linking Workshop a total in print of 200 pages of documentation. In addition, a research assistant conducted interviews with workshop participants. This resulted in 60 more pages of manuscript. Next, field notes of direct observation were supplied by selected Linking Workshop participants before, during, and for a seven month period after the workshop. Finally, minutes of various Partner Schools meetings, Partnership Governing Board meetings, and Partnership Coordinating Council meetings were examined.

*1. Linking Workshop Proceedings*

Workshop participants went through three interaction processes or linking stages: (A.) Presentation, (B.) Discussion, and (C.) Finalization. The four curriculum areas of thinking, language arts, math, and reading were selected as major strands for the 16 hour workshop. Twenty-four university professors, eight principals, and 88 teachers were assigned by workshop planners in approximately even numbers to one of the four strands according to their stated interests, experience, and expertise.

*Stage A. Presentation.* The majority of presentations consisted of lecture accompanied by printed handouts, overhead projections, and video clips. Strand lectures were videotaped and

transcribed for analysis. All presenters were invited to correct rough copies of the workshop proceedings.

*Stage B. Discussion.* During the discussion stage each strand group was divided into interaction groups of six with three participants in each group assigned specific roles as facilitator, recorder, and reporter. A process of elaborating, screening out, and refining was followed until the group produced a preliminary set of recommendations for renewal at the university and in the schools. Notes on poster paper were saved and later used to create the discussion stage data base. The pattern continued as the small groups reconvened into a large interaction group.

*Stage C. Finalization.* Participants were required during the finalization stage to become more discriminating and evaluative. Consensus was emphasized, and each group was challenged to prioritize recommendations based on importance to the renewal effort. Group recorders continued to make poster notes that were saved for later analysis. Again, the pattern was repeated when small groups regrouped into the large group format.

The last step in the finalization stage was to reconvene all strand groups into one large workshop assemblage. The entire assembly was given an opportunity to ratify the recommendations or make suggestions for modification. All poster notes, including final recommendations, were saved to provide additional sources for analysis.

*II. Interview Transcriptions*

Seven months following the Linking Workshop, 90-minute open-ended depth interviews were conducted with 16 Linking Workshop participants from the public schools. Interviewees were selected using a stratified random sampling technique from the original 96 school personnel, with categories representing district, school, and workshop strand. Participants were interviewed in pairs so that respondents could stimulate each other's reflection. All were tape recorded, with permission of the respondents, for further analysis.

*III. Field Notes and Minutes*

Though only school personnel were included in the depth interviews, the university response was well documented in an audit trail, minutes of meetings, field notes, and transcription of meetings that were audio or video taped. These documents were analyzed according to the four variable clusters

which suggest symbiotic or organic collaboration. A negative case analysis was also used to seek evidence that collaboration was not effective.

*Construct Validity and Bias*

In our dual roles as educators deeply involved in renewal and researchers studying university-school collaboration, we have recognized and attempted to address potential problems of bias and construct validity through varying our data collection procedures, allowing maximum time for data collection on site, and using multiple sources of evidence (Rist, 1982). These multiple sources of evidence essentially provide multiple measures of the same phenomenon and thus allow for triangulation (Spradley, 1980).

## *Data Analysis*

Since this was a study of collaboration between dissimilar partners, it was important, whenever possible, to examine the data from both partners' points of view. Data from workshop presentations, interviews, fieldnotes, and minutes of meetings were always coded as having originated with either university or school personnel. When the origin of data from workshop discussions and finalizations could not be discerned, the partner to whom recommendations were directed was identified.

*Analysis of Linking Workshop Proceedings*

Content analysis (Gay, 1987) of the Linking Workshop presentation, discussion, and finalization proceedings was undertaken to discover the form and substance of university-school interaction. Once this was known, we conducted a second-order, thematic analysis to find evidence of symbiotic or organic collaboration themes within the content of the workshop.

*Content Analysis of Presentation Transcriptions*

*Step 1-- Outlining topics.* Topics were selected by the presenters rather than imposed by the workshop leaders. The unedited transcriptions of eight university presenters and 16 school presenters were examined along with handout and display items which accompanied presentations. From these materials a four-level topic outline was created covering the thinking, language arts, math, and reading strands.

*Step 2-- Identifying and isolating the unit of analysis*. A single, coherent recommendation for renewal became the unit of analysis: for example, "The university must screen out student teachers who are not capable of controlling a class." Duplicates were eliminated.

*Step 3--Coding data*. Each recommendation for renewal was coded by origin and intended recipient.

*Content Analysis of Discussion Poster Notes*

Poster notes from discussion groups were analyzed to correspond with each strand recommendation.

*Content Analysis of Finalized Recommendation*

Each workshop strand recorder supplied a relatively well organized set of poster notes presenting the strand's final recommendations for renewal to the entire assembly. We isolated recommendations as single units and related them to the presentation outline.

*Thematic Analysis of Workshop Content*

Once the extensive content analysis had been completed, we prepared to conduct a meaningful quantitative analysis to disclose information related to the major themes of the study. We tallied frequency and computed appropriate percentages to answer these quantitative questions: (1) How many recommendations were made during the presentation, discussion, and finalization phases and to whom were they directed? (See Table 1) (2) How many and what percentage of recommendations were retained unchanged and how many were retained but changed or were dropped or were introduced new at each stage of strategic linking? (See Table 2) (3) How many and what percentage of recommendations did each partner originate in each strand during the presentations? (See Table 3)

*Analysis of Documents*

A thematic data analysis was also used on field notes, minutes, and audio or video tape transcriptions (Rist, 1982). This thematic approach emphasizes the clustering of material by key themes extracted from the Goodlad model of symbiotic or organic collaboration (common goals, participants and participation, equity and trust, and self-interest and selflessness). We related our analysis of the Linking Workshop field notes, minutes, and recordings to each of these four themes to discover relevant variables.

## Findings

### *Variable 1: Common Goals*

*Pulling Education Together*. One of the most significant variables identified was the shared focus of nearly all university and school participants on renewal of education. As one school participant said: "I saw it as an opportunity to pull education together. I've thought for years that everybody was kind of going in their own separate little channel, kind of like water going down a ditch that had sprung a leak and was going all directions. And I saw it as an opportunity for everybody to kind of focus on where education ought to be." Though many were quick to point out the differences between the university and schools, they were also aware of the similarities of purpose.

*Seeking Common Ground*. As the workshop progressed, common goals emerged, evidenced when recommendations directed towards the university, the schools, or both, were tracked across the linking workshop stages. The progress of collaboration can be traced through the quantitative record. 271 recommendations were made during the presentation stage. During the discussion stage, 223 of these were dropped, but 199 new recommendations emerged. From reconsideration in the finalization stage, 144 of the earlier recommendations were discarded, and only 14 new ideas were generated. This showed collaborative processes resulted in effective critical consideration as participants were able to understand the intersection in university and school purposes. (See Table 2)

*Unifying the University*. Though most participants viewed the university and schools engaged in a common task, some school participants perceived a lack of agreement among university faculty. One participant voiced this uncertainty, "I'm not sure the university is unified on what they really want in this partnership and if all the professors have all the same goal in mind. If it's good, which I believe it is, in fact, I believe they can't exist up there by themselves. I believe we're all in this education together."

A sample of some professors' comments made during a faculty meeting revealed views on educational renewal and the partnership that varied from those of faculty involved in planning the workshop. "Why is it assumed that we will work in the partnership? I never came here to do this." "I don't understand why department resources should be used to pay school people to attend this

workshop. That's like medical doctors paying their patients to come in for treatment. Do doctors and lawyers consult without charge?"

*Neophytes*. A few campus-based faculty were not the only participants who had trouble embracing common goals. Some school participants were obviously confused by the workshop purposes and proceedings and thus could not have experienced much symbiotic collaboration. As an observer put it: "I think there were some who were brand-new teachers who aren't very versed in Partnership. I think there's been some confusion....The first whole talk session all we did was answer partnership questions." For some participants, the interaction involved learning what symbiotic collaboration meant and what the specific tasks in the collaborative work were.

*Skewed Toward Preservice*. When participants focused on Partnership goals, we noted some skewing toward renewing education of educators while neglecting the equally important renewal of schools.

*Variable 2. Participants and Participation*

*Planning*. The Partner Schools Committee appointed a subcommittee to organize the Linking Workshop. Both university and school representatives were on the subcommittee, but once the workshop purposes and outline were established, most of the detailed work was done by a small group of university people who were able to meet frequently on campus and access university resources.

*Strand Speakers and Time Allotment*. The initial presentations for each strand were given by four teachers and two university professors for a total of sixteen school presenters and eight university presenters. The same amount of time was allowed for university speakers and for school presenters.

*Group Facilitators*. When the participants worked in small groups, school people were assigned as group facilitators and both school and university people were assigned as recorders and reporters. When large groups were formed, university people who had served on the planning subcommittee acted as facilitators.

*Makeup of Strands*. Each strand consisted of 22 teachers (78%), two principals (8%), and four university professors (14%). To facilitate cross-school networking, care was taken not to include more than three teachers from any one school . From the university 64% (17 out of 25) of their faculty

attended including the Chair of Elementary Education and the College Dean. Fifty to sixty percent of school faculties were present including 100% of their principals and 50% of the representatives from district offices.

*Small Group Interaction*. During the two-day workshop, several small group sessions of approximately six persons were held. These typically consisted of one professor, one principal, and four teachers, each from different schools and school districts. Discussions were free flowing with most individuals contributing freely. School people did not defer to university people nor teachers to principals. University professors did not patronize teachers. As public school participants commented, "In my group, the college professors were really supportive and really into the groups." "We didn't feel like we were there just to learn; we felt like we were there to contribute." "I saw that open dialogue and the willingness to accept the criticism and make some honest changes."

*Nonparticipation*. Over the entire two-day workshop, no school personnel dropped out. They were paid a stipend of $220 for completing the full experience. Four or five of the professors who participated part of the first day were not able to return the second day due to prior commitments.

*Variable 3. Equity and Trust*

Although the dissimilarity between the cultures of the university and the schools and the resulting mutual distrust have been blamed for the failure of university-school collaboration (Bart, 1984; Maeroff, 1983; Haberman, 1971), a three-year study of trust within this partnership showed a growth pattern (Bloom & Baird, 1989). Our informants confirmed that they occasionally sensed differences and felt overtones of distrust. However, according to some participants, differences were perceived as beneficial, "I think that dissimilarity is very appropriate. I'm glad that somebody doesn't think that the way I do everything is always right. I'm glad that there's somebody that has another opinion about it."

*Equality*. School participants frequently expressed their feelings about equity in the linking workshop and the partnership in general, "It wasn't an 'I'm better than you.' kind of thing. It just kind of pulled everybody together just as we are." University professors who work in the field commented along similar lines. "I see great teaching every day, and I marvel ...as to how these

teachers keep coming up with fresh ideas. Here she is presenting those ideas in a very professional manner."

It appears that greater equity of thinking about renewal emerged as the linking process moved from stage to stage. (See Table 1) At the conclusion of the presentations in the first stage, nearly twice as many recommendations for renewal were directed at the schools (58%) as at the university (31%), with only a few (11%) directed at both. By the finalization stage, recommendations for renewal were distributed almost in thirds between the university (39%), the schools (26%), and both (35%).

*Trust.* Though data have not been fully substantiated, they support the assertion that trust--necessary to all productive relationships involving collaboration--existed during the workshop and exists as an element of the partnership context. Many have expressed a feeling of rapport that represents a breakdown of old suspicions and prejudices, "I think the partnership has become a tightly knit, cohesive group where people are comfortable expressing feelings, ideas, whatever and doing so productively." The degree of trust manifest during two days of intensive dialogue was influenced by a sense that university professors cared for and valued school educators and their ideas.

Because of numerous Partner School experiences prior to the workshop, much of the natural intimidation on both sides was diffused. A professor who had spent the majority of his university time working in schools said, "Nearly every teacher in our building has seen me teach and scripted one or more of my lessons. They know I'm not perfect, but at least they know I can teach and I'm willing to be criticized and improve from feedback." Teachers, too, have coped with intimidation from professors. "We've rubbed shoulders enough with them that we don't allow ourselves to be intimidated. I don't think they ever meant to be intimidating. But we allow ourselves to be intimidated: 'We're just elementary schools teachers.' And after you present [at professional conferences] with them and things, then you get to the point where you don't feel that way."

*Variable 4. Self-interest and Selflessness*

*Mutual Self-Interest.* Workshop participants did reveal their vision of university-school mutual self-interest. They saw the learner as the point of mutual self-interest. As one participant expressed it, "This is going to affect our school. We can then say it's going to benefit the university too. Because I think we still have to put the university and the schools together with the kids in the middle like

making a sandwich. Those two pieces of bread have to come together to help finish the sandwich to give that child the education he needs. So hopefully we're turning out the teachers from the university and are going to bring along teachers that are there intact now." Mutual self-interest was also shown in the directionality of recommendations in the finalization stage: 40% of the recommendations were directed towards joint renewal, where only 39% were directed at the university and 26% at the schools (See Table 1).

*Anxiety for Imbalance of Self-Interest.* Some school people expressed concern about what the university was deriving from the partnership, "But I sometimes wonder, what are we [schools] giving back to them [the university]? ...What do we do for them other than let the student teachers come in and provide people to be on committees?" Other school people mentioned their concern that the university had not articulated its self-interests, "I'm not sure I know what the university's self-interests are. I don't think that they made that very clear. "

A few university professors expressed a perception that little was being derived by the university, "If I go from school to school giving inservice training when will I write this book? I have a contract and a deadline. The university reward system will not promote me for giving workshops."

In contrast, a minority of school informants mentioned that they viewed the balance in favor of the university, "...the reality of it is, BYU can't run their program without the public schools to put their students into. We can run our program without BYU.... So something has to change in order for it to be equal to both parties, to be equally appealing to both parties."

*Selflessness.* The selflessness variable was probably the hardest to track; however, we have found some preliminary indicators. For instance, a school person who expressed sympathy with a university faculty's professional load appeared to be engaged in selfless thinking, "I feel bad for the field professors.... It has increased their load.... They must deal with us too." On the other hand, the fact that a majority (61%) of recommendations by school personnel were directed at themselves compared to less than a majority (40%) of recommendations by university faculty being directed at themselves suggests selflessness on the part of the school participants. (See Table 3) Further, the fact that workshop participants could consider 484 recommendations for renewal and reduce the accepted

number to 117 in an amiable agreement suggests selflessness of both university and school personnel (See Table 2).

## Summary and Conclusion

Although the partnership has experienced some of the impediments shared by other university/school partnerships, analysis of quantitative and qualitative data from a recent Linking Workshop sponsored by the partnership shows high levels of agreement on common educational renewal goals and participation by university and school personnel in all aspects of the collaborative effort. Acceptance of professional equity is evident, as is a trusting relationship between the partners. And finally, sufficient mutual self-interest and selflessness sustained the effort through numerous changes in university and district leadership, as well as refinements of organizational structure.

On collaboration, external evaluators have said, "The governance structure for the partnership appears to mirror a commitment to true collaboration." (Clark & Wilson, 1990 p. 3). On Partner Schools, external evaluators have declared, "BYU's work on Partner Schools is much more advanced than elsewhere in the nation. In the BYU partnership we observed a number of such partner schools functioning in a more sophisticated fashion than many of the 'experts' are able to describe in their imagining about what such institutions should be like." (Clark & Wilson, 1990 p. 1).

In general, we have concluded from these findings that with certain policies in place, symbiotic/organic collaboration between a university and schools (districts) is feasible and realistic. Below, we will summarize findings and draw relevant conclusions for each of four variables we deem critical to authentic symbiotic/organic collaboration.

### *Common Goal*

Analysis of the data indicated that the vast majority of workshop participants from both the university and the schools saw the renewal of education as the common goal for collaboration. Our data also revealed that over the course of the two-day collaborative event, university and school participants grew towards each other in embracing common goals.

### *Participants and Participation*

We discovered that high percentages of university faculty, department, and college administrators as well as public school teachers, principals, and district administrators participated in

planning and implementing this collaborative event. Nearly all participants remained through the entire 16 hours of workshop processing. Only a few professors who were double scheduled by prior commitments failed to participate to the conclusion.

*Equity and Trust*

Our data infers that university and school educators can be different in their perceptions and strategies yet still esteem each other as colleagues. A strikingly large proportion of school participants commented that they were treated as professional equals by university participants, and many university participants expressed respect and admiration for their colleagues in the schools. These data have strongly suggested a growing trust among the participants not only between the schools and the university, but among the schools and school districts as well.

*Self-Interest and Selflessness*

Of all collaboration variables, self-interest and selflessness were the most challenging to assess. A small minority of both university and school participants defined self-interest narrowly and expressed concern that they were not gaining personally from the Partner School effort in general or the Linking Workshop in particular.

The concern expressed by some school participants that the university has not clarified its self-interests sufficiently was a meaningful finding to us. Although it appears that university self-interests for teacher preparation were well served, the self-interest of scholarly productivity suffered neglect. Only one of 117 final recommendations for renewal explicitly mentions research and none of them mentions scholarly publication.

Selflessness was evident throughout the proceedings of the Linking Workshop. The final set of recommendations for renewal included more than 30% directing the university and school to act jointly for renewal, a sharp contrast to the individually-centered recommendations given in earlier stages of the workshop. University and school participants were willing to set aside personal agendas and vigorously respond to the ideas for renewal their colleagues proposed.

## Implications for Policy

*Policy for Common Goals.* Universities must see the importance in working to renew the schools (districts) along with their major task of preparing new teachers and educational leaders. Similarly, schools (districts) must add preparing new teachers to their fundamental responsibility of educating youth. The BYU-Public School Partnership made a long-term commitment at every level of both institutions along with substantial redefinition of roles to achieve the degree of congruity that the data have shown (Bracey, 1990; Goodlad, 1988b).

*Policy for Participants and Participation.* Growth, change, renewal, and reform are not "spectator sports." Classroom teachers must strive toward inquiry and growth, just as campus professors must orient toward practice and reality. Teachers and principals in other partnership schools that are requesting to become Partner Schools must be included in the renewal effort (Harris, 1990). In the BYU-Public School Partnership, teachers, principals, district administrators, university professors and administrators increasingly work together and share actively in the administration and daily work of the partnership.

*Policy for Equity and Trust.* The long-standing cycle of animosity which results when professors remain aloof from the problems of practice and school personnel avoid innovation to maintain the status quo must be broken. New respect emerges when these educators mingle with each other, listen to each other, assist each other, and show each other the human, authentic dimensions of their professional and, occasionally, their private lives (Lofgreen, 1988).

*Policy for Self-Interest and Selflessness.* Symbiotic/organic collaboration should not blur responsibility. Schools (districts) should continue to be primarily responsible for educating the nation's youth. Universities should continue to focus their efforts on preparing new educators. However, self-interest must be tempered with a willingness for one partner to give of oneself for the other. Although it may mean setting aside portions of one's own agenda for the sake of one's partner, ultimately there is little sacrifice.

BYU students will more likely develop into competent teachers if they practice teach with highly competent mentor teachers and are exposed daily to schools where renewal is a way of professional life. Schools will be more likely to attain their goals in assisting the youth to think,

know, and act intelligently if current teachers are learning and growing and if new teachers are eminently prepared to teach. We are beginning to observe these linked processes in the Partner Schools.

*Future Research Needs*

No doubt, this partnership has far to go in working toward these policy goals. However, this study has revealed that the goals can be attained, and those affiliated with Partner Schools are progressing toward that achievement. Further research must delve beyond the issue of feasibility dealt with in this study and address the issue of desirability. Are the results of symbiotic/organic collaboration worth the costs? We need to now look for the impact of the 117 final recommendations for renewal on the university and on the schools. What has happened to the 45 recommendations directed at the university, the 30 recommendations directed at the school, and the 42 recommendations directed at both the university and schools in tandem? Is renewal actually taking place?

## References

Arends, R. I. (1990). Connecting the university to the school. In Bruce Joyce (Ed.) *Changing School Culture Through Staff Development, 1990 ASCD Yearbook*, Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Bloom, L. A., & Baird, J. E. (1989). *Three-year study of five elementary schools in the Brigham Young University/Public School Partnership*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, October 5-7, Jackson, Wyoming.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Bracey, G. W. (1990). Rethinking school and university roles. *Educational Leadership*, 47(8), 65-66.

Clark, D. & Wilson, C. (1990). *Interim report*. Memorandum dated May 22, 1990 to Joe Bishop, Executive Director of the BYU-Public School Partnership from Dick Clark and Carol Wilson, The National Network for Educational Renewal, 574 West Sixth Avenue, Denver, Colorado 80204.

Gay, L. R. (1987). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing.

Goodlad, J. I. (1986). *Linking schools and universities: Symbiotic partnerships*. Occasional Paper No. 1, Center for Educational Renewal. Seattle: College of Education, University of Washington.

Goodlad, J. I. (1988a). *The National Network for Educational Renewal: Past, present, future*. Occasional Paper No. 7, Center for Educational Renewal. Seattle: College of Education, University of Washington.

Goodlad, J. I. (1988b). School-university partnerships: Rationale and concepts. In K. A. Sirotinik and J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-University Partnerships in Action*. NY: Teachers College.

Green, E. E., & Harris, R. C. (1990). Creating long-term collaboration: The BYU/Public School Partnership experience. *Tech Trends*, 35(1), 12-16.

Haberman, M. (1971). Twenty-three reasons why universities can't educate teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 22, 133-140.

Harris, M. R. (1990). *Elementary partner schools: Conditions for expansion*. Unpublished master's thesis, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

Harris, R. C., Baird, J. E., Bloom, L., McDougal, B., Argyle, S., Huff, S., Billings, T., & Andersen, D. W. (1989a). *Teacher education in Partner School: School/university collaboration in preservice, curriculum development, inservice, and research*. 1989 Distinguished Program in Teacher Education Finalist, Annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, St. Louis, February 18-22.

Harris, R. C., Baird, J. E., Bloom, L., & Tuttle, M. (1989b). *Brigham Young University-Public Schools linking workshop, August 11-12, 1989*. Unpublished workshop handbook, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, 150 pages.

Howe, K., & Eisenhart, M. (1990). Standards for qualitative (and quantitative) research: A prolegomenon. *Educational Researcher*, 19(4), 2-9.

Lofgreen, K. B. (1988). *Teacher efficacy in a partner school*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

Maeroff, G. I. (1983). *School and college partnerships in education*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher*, 17(2), 13-17.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Olson, L. (1986). Schools, universities in 10 states have joined Goodlad's "Network for Educational Renewal'. *Education Week*, 5(32), 1.

Olson, L. (1987). Network for renewal: Goodlad seeks stronger school-university alliances. *Education Week*, 6(25), 1.

Rist, R. C. (1982). On the application of ethnographic inquiry to education: Procedures and possibilities. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 19, 439-450.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. NY: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Trubowitz, S., Duncan, W., Fibkins, W., Longo, P., & Sarason, S. (1984). *When a college works with a public school: A case study of school-college collaboration*. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

Wilbur, F. P., Lambert, L. M., & Young, M.J. (1988). *School college partnerships: A look at the major national models*. Washington, DC: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Yinger, R. J., & Hendricks, M. S. (1990). An overview of reform in Holmes Group institutions. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(2), 21-26.

## Authors

CARL HARRIS, Associate Professor, Brigham Young University, 210-V, MCKB, Provo, Utah 84602. *Specializations*: field-based teacher education, university-school collaboration, metacognition in teaching and learning.

MELANIE FOX HARRIS, Intern Coordinator and Teacher, Rees Elementary School, Spanish Fork, Utah 84660. Was on a one-year leave from a partnership district to study the expansion of Partner Schools.

TABLE 1.

Number of Renewal Recommendations for University, School, or Both University and School by Linking Stage

| | University | | | | | | Schools | | | | | | Both | | | | | | Total | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Linking Stages | | | | | | Linking Stages | | | | | | Linking Stages | | | | | | Linking Stages | | | | | |
| | Present | | Discuss | | Final | | Present | | Discuss | | Final | | Present | | Discuss | | Final | | Present | | Discuss | | Final | |
| Strands | | % | | | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | | % |
| Thinking | 29 | 32 | 27 | 28 | 16 | 38 | 49 | 54 | 25 | 26 | 14 | 33 | 12 | 14 | 43 | 46 | 12 | 29 | 90 | 40 | 95 | 42 | 42 | 18 |
| Lang. Arts | 1 | 2 | 8 | 16 | 6 | 30 | 40 | 93 | 13 | 27 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 5 | 28 | 57 | 12 | 60 | 43 | 38 | 49 | 44 | 20 | 19 |
| Math | 21 | 44 | 39 | 55 | 18 | 49 | 23 | 48 | 10 | 14 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 22 | 31 | 17 | 46 | 48 | 31 | 71 | 46 | 37 | 24 |
| Reading | 34 | 38 | 10 | 31 | 5 | 28 | 44 | 49 | 17 | 53 | 12 | 67 | 12 | 13 | 5 | 16 | 1 | 5 | 90 | 64 | 32 | 23 | 18 | 13 |
| Overall | 85 | 31 | 84 | 34 | 45 | 39 | 156 | 58 | 65 | 26 | 30 | 26 | 30 | 11 | 98 | 40 | 42 | 35 | 271 | 43 | 247 | 39 | 117 | 18 |

TABLE 2.
Status of Renewal Recommendations by Linking Stage

| Strands | Linking Stage | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Present | | Discuss | | Final | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Thinking | | | | | | |
| Retain | | | 21 | 22 | 30 | 71 |
| Unchanged | | | 5 | 24 | 12 | 40 |
| Changed | | | 16 | 76 | 18 | 60 |
| Dropped | | | 69 | 77* | 65 | 68* |
| New | | | 74 | 78 | 12 | 29 |
| Active Pool | 90 | 100 | 95 | 100 | 42 | |
| Language Arts | | | | | | 100 |
| Retain | | | 4 | 8 | 19 | 95 |
| Unchanged | | | 2 | 50 | 10 | 53 |
| Changed | | | 2 | 50 | 9 | 47 |
| Dropped | | | 39 | 91* | 9 | 61* |
| New | | | 45 | 92 | 1 | 5 |
| Active Pool | 43 | 100 | 49 | 100 | 20 | 100 |
| Math | | | | | | |
| Retain | | | 15 | 21 | 36 | 97 |
| Unchanged | | | 0 | 0 | 23 | 64 |
| Changed | | | 15 | 100 | 13 | 36 |
| Dropped | | | 33 | 69* | 35 | 49* |
| New | | | 56 | 79 | 1 | 3 |
| Active Pool | 48 | 100 | 71 | 100 | 37 | 100 |
| Reading | | | | | | |
| Retain | | | 8 | 25 | 18 | 100 |
| Unchanged | | | 1 | 13 | 13 | 72 |
| Changed | | | 7 | 87 | 5 | 27 |
| Dropped | | | 82 | 91* | 14 | 44* |
| New | | | 24 | 75 | 0 | 0 |
| Active Pool | 90 | 100 | 32 | 100 | 18 | |
| All Strands | | | | | | |
| Retain | | | 48 | 19 | 103 | 88 |
| Unchanged | | | 8 | 17 | 58 | 56 |
| Changed | | | 40 | 83 | 45 | 44 |
| Dropped | | | 223 | 82* | 144 | 58* |
| New | | | 199 | 81 | 14 | 12 |
| Active Pool | 271 | 100 | 257 | 100 | 117 | 100 |
| Cumulative Total | 271 | 56 | 470 | 97 | 484 | 100 |

*% figured using active recommendation pool from previous column

TABLE 3.

Origin and Direction of Renewal Recommendations from University and School Presenters by Strand

| Strands | Thinking | | Lang. Arts | | Math | | Reading | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Recommendations | 90 | 33 | 43 | 16 | 48 | 18 | 90 | 33 | 271 | |
| From University | 38 | 60 | 7 | 11 | 11 | 18 | 7 | 11 | 63 | 23 |
| From Schools | 52 | 25 | 36 | 17 | 37 | 18 | 83 | 40 | 208 | 77 |
| From University for University | 25 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 40 |
| From University for Schools | 7 | 23 | 6 | 20 | 11 | 37 | 6 | 20 | 30 | 48 |
| From University for Both | 6 | 75 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 8 | 12 |
| From Schools for Schools | 42 | 33 | 34 | 27 | 12 | 10 | 38 | 30 | 126 | 61 |
| From Schools for University | 4 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 21 | 35 | 34 | 57 | 60 | 29 |
| From Schools for Both | 6 | 27 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 18 | 11 | 50 | 22 | 10 |
| Total | 270 | 311 | 129 | 111 | 144 | 154 | 270 | 254 | 813 | 300 |